

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

**STEPHEN RAY MURRAY,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**MAYOR BILL WIGGINS et al.,**

**Defendants.**

)  
)  
)  
)  
) **No. 2:19-cv-00046**  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)


**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 59) recommending that Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss (Doc. Nos. 40, 44, 46) be granted, that Defendants Cobble, Farris, and Harsh’s Motion to Ascertain Status and renewed Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 57) be denied as moot, and that this action be dismissed. No objections have been filed. If there are no objections, the district court is not required to review the R&R *de novo*, and should “adopt the magistrate’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed.” Benson v. Walden Sec., No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at \*3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018) (citing Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985)); see also Frias v. Frias, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \*2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019).

The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R and the file in accordance with Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 59) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**. Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss (Doc. Nos. 40, 44, 46) are **GRANTED**, Defendants Cobble, Farris, and Harsh’s Motion to Ascertain Status and renewed Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 57) is **DENIED AS MOOT**, and

this action is **DISMISSED**. All other pending motions are **TERMINATED**. This Order constitutes a final judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58, and the Clerk is directed to close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WAVERLY D. CRENSHAW, JR.  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE